



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/600,050 06/20/2003		Marian Mankos	10011.001710 (P1100)	5853			
31894	7590	04/08/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
OKAMOT P.O. BOX 6		EDICTO, LLP	HASHMI, ZIA R				
SAN JOSE,		64	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
				2881			

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/600,	10/600,050 MANKOS ET AL.						
	Office Action Summary	Examine	Examiner Art Unit		<u>-</u>				
		Zia R. H.	ashmi	2881	AN				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun	nication appears on ti	ne cover sheet with t	he correspondence add	Iress				
THE - External after - If the - If NO - Failur	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN risions of time may be available under the provision: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com period for reply specified above is less than thirty (i) re to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months red patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e munication. 30) days, a reply within the st tatutory period will apply and y will, by statute, cause the ay	event, however, may a reply atutory minimum of thirty (30 will expire SIX (6) MONTHS application to become ABAND	be timely filed) days will be considered timely, from the mailing date of this cor ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	mmunication.				
Status									
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on <u>20 June 2003</u> .							
2a)□	This action is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This action is	non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	ion of Claims								
5) <u></u> 6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicat	ion Papers								
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on 20 June 200 Applicant may not request that any objected the oath or declaration is objected to	03 is/are: a)⊠ accept ection to the drawing(s) g the correction is requ	be held in abeyance. lired if the drawing(s) i	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CF					
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority 2. Certified copies of the priority 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation	y documents have be y documents have be s of the priority docur onal Bureau (PCT R	een received. een received in Appl nents have been rec ule 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National S	Stage				
2) Notice	et(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or No(s)/Mail Date 11/10/2003.		Paper No(s)/M	mary (PTO-413) ail Date mal Patent Application (PTO	-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/600,050

Art Unit: 2881

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo et al. (6,566,897), in view of Suzuki et al. (Pub. No: US 2003/0155508 A1).
- 3. With respect to independent claims 1, 9, 18 and dependent claim 14, Lo et al. disclose a method and apparatus for inspecting a substrate (Abstract, lines 1-2 and col. 5, lines 17-20) comprising: supporting the substrate into a holding place of a substrate holder; moving the substrate holder under the electron beam (col. 7, lines 40-51 and 14 in Fig. 1), applying voltage to the substrate holder (col. 7, lines 14-30 and 28 in Fig. 1), under an electron beam (18 and 22 in Fig. 1), wherein the voltage applied reduces a substrate edge effect or artifacts (col. 2, lines 35-67, col. 3, lines 1-3 & 55-59, col. 4, lines 1-8, col. 5, lines 10-12 & 17-20, and 22, 24, 30 & 32 in Fig. 1). Their system provides a mechanism for moving a semiconductor wafer holder under an electron beam (col. 7, lines 40-41, col. 8, lines 5-6, and 14 in Fig. 1).
- 4. With respect to claims 1-13 and 15-20, Lo et al. fail to disclose an isolated conductive element of the substrate holder comprising of an insulating element. Suzuki et al., however, disclose method of applying voltage (para 0028, lines 9-12) to a

Application/Control Number: 10/600,050

Art Unit: 2881

conductive element (para 0030, lines 1-11) of the substrate holder (para 0032, lines 22-24), under an electron beam (para 0024, lines 2-4), by means of power supply (23 in Fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine methods and apparatus of Lo and Suzuki et al. and add features like adjusting the voltage applied to the conductive element of the substrate holder according the gap size between an edge of the substrate and the holding place in order to reduce the edge effect distortion, which is well known to be eliminated by flooding a larger area by electrons on the sample than is imaged, or by pre-charging an area before moving to another area as practiced by Lo et al. (col. 5, lines 10-16), because Lo et al. teach (col. 1, lines 56-58) that charged particle beam inspection will likely become one of the most critical technologies in advanced semiconductor manufacture.

Conclusion

- 5. Jau et al. disclose (6, 710,342) a method and apparatus for scanning semiconductor wafers for reducing the edge and aliasing effects in wafer inspections.
- 6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

Application/Control Number: 10/600,050

Art Unit: 2881

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zia Hashmi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2473. The examiner can normally be reached between 8.30 AM- 5 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2477.

Zia Hashmi

April 3, 2004.

JOHN R. LEE

Page 4

CUPTY SORY PATENT EXAMINER